

Date: Wed, 29 Sep 93 04:30:11 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #353
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Wed, 29 Sep 93 Volume 93 : Issue 353

Today's Topics:

Codeless Tech Debate (Canadian Perspective)
Internet on the air
NEW State Dept FLASH (1st Amend angle)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Tue, 28 Sep 93 20:26:32 GMT
From: mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx!lkollar@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Codeless Tech Debate (Canadian Perspective)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

garys@Ingres.COM (Gary Swiger) writes:

>I agree... CW taught me alot about procedure and protocol on HF.

How? CW and protocol/procedure are two different things.

Please elaborate; I may be missing something.

--

Larry Kollar, KC4WZK | I like CW, but that doesn't mean I think every ham
lkollar@nyx.cs.du.edu | should have to learn it.

 "You mean you came back from the dead, to tell me I'm *odd*?"

Date: Tue, 28 Sep 1993 23:51:29 GMT

From: news.service.uci.edu!paris.ics.uci.edu!csulb.edu!library.ucla.edu!agate!
howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Internet on the air
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <DRT.93Sep27215041@cacciatore.mit.edu> drt@athena.mit.edu (David R
Tucker) writes:

>
>No, no. I'm not kidding and I'm not talking about interconnection.
>I'm talking about why anyone would bother typing with those modes when
>they can type with far more power by dialing in - it looks and feels
>the same. I mean that packet is an outmoded toy compared with the
>internet anyway. (RTTY, of course, is just a bad version of 'talk.')
>Why bother with it? It's as obsolete as ... morse code! which at
>least doesn't *pretend* to be up-to-date. And packet's far less
>interesting than either cw or the internet. If you want to sit at a
>terminal and type stuff in, why wait days for a message you can send
>in seconds, right here?

You are correct that those with a wired connection to the internet
often have faster and more comprehensive services than those on
radio. But the point of radio is *wireless* communications, and
those of us with 56kb, or faster, RF modems also often have higher
performance than we can obtain on the wired dialup network. Besides,
the commercial network providers get tense when we wish to *experiment*
with networking over their nets. Meanwhile, that's what the amateur
networks are for. We can experiment with topologies, protocols, and
encoding schemes to our heart's content on our own networks. People
who merely sit and type things in serve a useful purpose as test data
generators.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV	"If 10% is good enough	gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems	for Jesus, it's good	uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way	enough for Uncle Sam."	emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244	-Ray Stevens	

Date: Tue, 28 Sep 1993 20:35:59 GMT
From: spsgate!mogate!newsgate!news@uunet.uu.net
Subject: NEW State Dept FLASH (1st Amend angle)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Sep28.182206.11893@Csl.Stanford.EDU> paulf@Csl.Stanford.EDU
(Paul Flaherty) writes:

> ...

> There have been at least two actions taken under the ITU agreement since WWI.
> The first was the cessation of amateur radio during WWII, from a few days
> after Pearl Harbor to a few months after VJ Day. The second (that I know of)
> was a prohibition against contacts with North Viet Nam during the Viet Nam
> War.

> ...

Weren't there a few other countries on that list? Seems to me I remember Sudan,
North Korea, Cuba, and maybe China? I think it was the same set that U.S.
citizens weren't allowed to visit (there used to be a warning in the
passports).

Mark AA7TA

Date: Tue, 28 Sep 1993 23:32:05 GMT

From: news.service.uci.edu!paris.ics.uci.edu!csulb.edu!library.ucla.edu!agate!
howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <rcrw90-170993125438@node_142cf.aieg.mot.com>, <CDtzK0.8o@fc.hp.com>,
<CE1Bn9.A6@news.Hawaii.Edu>

Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)

Subject : Re: Codeless Tech Debate

In article <CE1Bn9.A6@news.Hawaii.Edu> jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu (Jeff
Herman) writes:

>

>I believe one reason the FCC has kept the code test is that they
>desire a demonstration of a learned skill relating to communications,
>in addition to the multiple choice portion. Do packet, AMTOR, RTTY, ATV,
>and the others require any skill level close to code? (I don't know
>since I don't operate any mode except code.) If or when the code
>requirement is deleted, other than constructing a radio in the presence
>of the VE, what skill can be demonstrated? Sketching schematics and block
>diagrams? There HAS to be something else in addition to the multiple
>choice portion; that should NOT be the only prerequisite to receiving
>a license.

The FCC has tried 3 times in the past 15 years to eliminate the Morse
testing requirement for at least some classes of licenses. Two of
those times they were shouted down by a certain reactionary group.
The FCC really doesn't care about mechanical reflexes programmed by
repetitive drill into wetware. They care about the charter expressed
in 97.1, and recognized that Morse testing requirements were a drag
on achieving that charter.

Standardized testing is good enough for commercial licensing and

good enough for the College Boards. A well designed standardized test is fair, and more important, is seen to be fair, it's easy to grade without bias, and it's cheap to do on a mass scale. The purpose of FCC testing is to demonstrate the necessary familiarity with the rules and regulations, and knowledge of the technical requirements of radio, such that an operator can be assumed responsible for maintaining technical compliance with the rules in a way that will minimize the possibility of interference to other services. In the past, when other services depended on CW modulation using Morse encoding, a working knowledge of Morse was useful in determining whether interference to a primary service was occurring. That's largely no longer the case, even at HF.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV	"If 10% is good enough	gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems	for Jesus, it's good	uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way	enough for Uncle Sam."	emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244	-Ray Stevens	

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #353
